

ORDER

Came on for consideration the above-captioned action wherein
David Glen Harris is petitioner ("Harris") and Douglas Dretke,
Director, Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional
Institutions Division, is respondent. This is a petition for writ
of habeas corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On April
25, 2006, the United States Magistrate Judge issued his proposed
findings, conclusions, and recommendation, and ordered that the
parties file objections, if any, thereto by May 25. On May 8,
Harris filed his written objections. In accordance with 28
U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil
Procedure, the court makes a de novo determination of those
portions of the proposed findings or recommendations to which
specific objection is made. United States v. Raddatz, 447 U.S.

Case 4:06-cv-00280-A Document 8 Filed 05/11/06 Page 2 of 2 PageID 85

667 (1980). The court is not addressing any nonspecific objections or any frivolous or conclusory objections. Battle v. United States Parole Comm'n, 834 F.2d 419, 421 (5th Cir. 1987).

The magistrate judge recommended the petition be dismissed as successive pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(1). Harris objects to that result because he was not informed prior to filing his first petition that he had to file "one 'all-inclusive' petition or thereafter seek permission from the United States Court of Appeals." Pet'r Objections at 2. There is nothing in the law that requires Harris to receive notice of any provision of applicable law prior to filing his first petition for writ of habeas corpus. Therefore,

The court accepts the findings, conclusions and recommendation of the magistrate judge and ORDERS that the petition be, and is hereby, dismissed as sufcessive.

SIGNED May _____, 2006.

JOHN WCBRYDE

United States District Judge